



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Arminianism, and teaches that the Saviour shed His blood for all men; another clergyman preaches Calvinism, and teaches He did not die for all men, but only for the elect. One clergyman teaches every child duly baptised is necessarily regenerated; another clergyman teaches that this is Popery. One clergyman teaches that good works are necessary to salvation; another holds that they are nothing but filthy rags. Now, amid this discordancy of doctrines in the same Church, what, in the name of common sense, is a man to do? Which of them is right? They both can't be right, but both may be wrong.

I admit, sir, the good temper exhibited in your columns, and though our doctrines are sometimes not fairly stated, yet I believe they are not misstated wilfully. I am an old man anxious to know the truth, and, knowing it, to practice it.

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

[We cannot claim for our article on private judgment such distinguished authorship as our correspondent gives us credit for. But we make no pretensions to originality, and we frankly acknowledge (what, indeed, we could not conceal from any attentive reader of the works of the late referred to) that our correspondent has guessed rightly the source of most of our arguments and illustrations.

We cannot find that our correspondent has succeeded in overthrowing any one of the principles laid down in our article. He tells us that "private judgment is not the exclusive privilege of Protestants, and that Roman Catholics dare exercise it for themselves." This was the very point which we laboured in our article to prove. We tried to show that a Roman Catholic's whole religious position was founded on an exercise of private judgment; and, therefore, that whatever uncertainty or other disadvantage attends the exercise of private judgment, affects the Roman Catholic as well as the Protestant.

Let us take our correspondent's illustration—the case of Dr. Newman, or any other Anglican who joins the Romish communion. It is evident he must begin with a most audacious exercise of private judgment. He must, by his own private study of Scripture, come to the conclusion that the Church in which he was baptised is heretical and schismatical; and that the clergy who are his guides, or the bishops who are set over him, are all mistaken. But, according to our correspondent, when he has once convinced himself of the existence of an infallible guide, private judgment ceases, and doubt ceases. We reply that he can never disentangle his belief of whatever doubt and uncertainty there may be about the first great act of private judgment on which all the rest depends. Father Newman arrived at his present position by the exercise of his private judgment on the texts—"Hear the Church," "The pillar and ground of the truth," &c. Now, these are as hard texts as any in the Bible. If private judgment can arrive with positive certainty at the meaning of these texts, why should it not be trusted with the interpretation of other texts? But if private judgment is always liable to doubt and mistake, Dr. Newman may have been wrong in his inferring, from these texts, the infallibility of the Church of Rome, and, therefore, also, wrong in all that he has received on that Church's authority.

If a man constructs a scaffold of wood, and then proceeds to build, with brick and stone, on the top of it, it is in vain for him to boast of the strength of his building and the solidity of his materials, the whole structure cannot be stronger than the scaffold on which it rests. And if the wood-work beneath be rotten, the more solid materials he lays on it the sooner it is likely to bring the whole thing about his ears.

Our correspondent says, "I cannot err in following Christ, who is my Captain. I cannot do wrong when doing implicitly what He prescribes."

Granted. But you may do wrong by supposing that our Lord has prescribed what He has not prescribed. You may err by fancying that you are following Christ, when, in reality, you are only taking the course which promises to relieve you quickest from the trouble and responsibility of investigation into truth.

Lastly, our correspondent taunts us with the differences of opinion which exist between those who do not profess to follow an infallible guide. Now, the whole question is, do these differences relate to essential points? For Roman Catholics have their differences too, but they say they do not relate to essential points. Why may not members of the Church of England urge the same plea? There are in our Church, Calvinists and Arminians, but the Arminians do not deny the possibility that Calvinists may be saved, nor the Calvinists the possibility that Arminians may be saved. And even on our correspondent's own principles, he would not argue that Christ must have provided His Church with an infallible guide, who should preserve it from every possible controversy or error, but only from going wrong on those points where an error would be fatal to salvation.]

THE RULE OF CATHOLIC FAITH, WHAT IS IT? TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—Considering the zeal displayed by some to make converts to the Roman faith, and the various persecutions which Protestants have at different periods undergone for refusing to embrace that faith, and particularly for refusing to subscribe to the doctrine of transubstantia-

tion, we have hitherto been led to believe that our doctrine and teaching are as opposite as the north is to the south; so different, indeed, that a Romanist Romanist must believe that there can be no salvation for us Protestants, out of their Church, &c., if we do not subscribe their doctrines. Many of us have had practical experience of the bitter feelings and animosities existing against the "reformed religion."

With a knowledge that such sentiments do exist, it may be new to some of your readers to hear that the Church of Rome had, nevertheless, produced some apologists for their system, who have argued that it is not so opposed to the Protestant faith as it is represented to be, either by members of their own communion or by "the gentlemen of the reformed religion," among whom stand prominent Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, and Veron. Bossuet wrote his "Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church" expressly to prove "that the aversion which these gentlemen (of the reformed religion) have to most of our [Romish] sentiments is grounded upon some false ideas which they have formed concerning them" (Dublin Edition, 1801, sec. 1, p. 5), and he argues that on examination many subjects of existing dispute vanish, "and those disputes which remain will not appear (according to the principles of the reformed) of such magnitude as at first they endeavoured to represent them" (p. 6). While Veron has taken every peculiar doctrine of the Roman Church against which we protest, as having no warranty in Scripture, and dressed them up in such harmless, equivocal, negative garbs that he has not only made them plausibile to Protestants, but has even given up, one after the other, the unnecessary to be believed in that strict and rigid manner so much insisted upon by many Romish controversialists, those tenets which Romanists have usually held so sacred.

You did me the favour of inserting one letter of this subject in your January number, wherein I observed that, according to Veron, the whole practical teaching of "saint worship" is, if not actually repudiated, so ignored and *negated* that we might be all sound Papists, and discredit their whole theory and practice in this important branch of doctrine and teaching. I propose now, with your kind permission, to follow up the subject, and show how, according to Veron, one may hold the Protestant doctrine of the *spiritual presence* of Christ in the Eucharist, and still be a sound and orthodox Romanist. But before I proceed to Veron, permit me to call the reader's attention to a strange blunder Bossuet makes, in his zeal to assimilate Protestant and Romish teaching. If there is a subject on which we so widely differ it is that on "merit of good works." These words Bossuet very properly selects as a title for a separate section in the work above mentioned (sec. vii., p. 22). He is most anxious to show how we agree on this important head. He says that they (Romanists) use the word "merit" to "show the value, price, and dignity of those works which we perform through grace. But as all their sanctity comes from God, who produces them in us, the same Church has, in the Council of Trent, received these words of St. Augustine, as a DOCTRINE OF CATHOLIC FAITH that 'God crowns His own gifts in crowning the merits of His servants'" (p. 23). Now, this is eminently a Protestant sentiment, and they, therefore, so shocked the propriety of certain learned theologians of the Roman Church that we find in that standard of orthodoxy, the "Expurgatory Index," these very words of Augustine ordered to be expunged from his works, as conveying decidedly heretical teaching.

The Churches of England and Ireland teach that there is a *real* presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but after a *spiritual* manner, and is so received by the faithful recipient. "Our souls are nourished by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine." We deny that these elements change their substance; they still remain what they seem to the eye and taste, literal *bread* and *wine*; but we feed on Christ *spiritually*, these elements being *signs*, *types*, *symbols*, or *figures* (the outward and visible signs) of His body and blood (the thing signified). For holding this doctrine many of our reformers were brought to the stake, and burnt alive; it was declared a "damnable heresy." We have hitherto believed that the great distinction between us and Romanists is, that they repudiate this *spiritual* presence. They require us to believe, under pain of anathema (for, thank God, they cannot now burn us), that the consecrated elements are no longer what they seem to be, but that the whole *substance* of the elements is changed, *or* as they express themselves, transubstantiated into the body, blood, bones and nerves, soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. They are no longer *bread* and *wine*, but entire Christ—"true God and true man under the appearance of each;" and the mass is the "same sacrifice" as was made on the cross. It is "the same Christ who once offered Himself a bleeding victim to His heavenly Father on the cross" (see Dr. James Butler's Catechism, Dublin, 1845, p. 59, 60); the same Christ who was born of the Virgin Mary. And so Cardinal Biel, in his Fourth Lecture on the Canon of the Mass, says, "The Virgin Mary once conceived the Son of God, while the priest

* Ex Iudeo Augustini Scolast. "Non merita nostra, sed donum dei deus consistit in nobis" &c.—Index Expurgator. jesus, Bernard de Carboval et Roxas Madrid, 1612, et per Turretin. Geneve 1619.

daily calls into existence corporally the same Son of God." And that the manducation is carnal and sensual is clear from the declaration that *Baranga rups* was composed by Pope Nicholas II., at a council, to sign, in the presence of 118 bishops, which states that "the body and blood of Christ is sensibly not only in the sacrament, but verily handled by the priest, broken and rent with the teeth of the faithful."

Now, what meaning does Veron present to us? Referring to 1 Cor. xvi. 44, he says, "Hence the body of Christ, which is present under the eucharistic symbols, may, in this sense, be called spiritual, and not carnal body; and our Saviour, who is actually present in the sacrament, may be called a quickening spirit, and not made into a living body."

The Italics are in all these quotations as in the original. Again—

"Not only may the body of Christ, though really present under the eucharistic symbols, be called a *spiritual* body, and Christ Himself a *spirit*; but the body of Christ may beseem to be present under the appearance of bread and wine, in a *spiritual* manner, or *spiritually*, and not in a *corporeal* and *natural* manner, or, which is the same thing, not *corporeally* or *carnally*" (p. 99).

"We do not eat Christ in this manner (by anastomosing and dividing); therefore he is not eaten corporeally, nor in a corporeal and carnal, but in a spiritual, manner; and by consequence spiritually" (p. 100).

"If it were to happen that a mouse or a dog were to gnaw or eat the host, or rather the eucharistic species, though these animals might consume the accidents, they would not eat the body of Christ" (p. 103).

It must be remembered that the *substance* of bread has, according to Tridentine doctrine, ceased to exist, and the shape, colour, &c.—that is, the accidents—only remain. What, then, does the mouse consume?

"Man, indeed (adds Veron), eats the body of Christ, because he receives it as a sign, or rather as the cause of grace." "Our adversaries ought really to make no objection to this doctrine; for, suppose a dog should chance to eat a piece of the bread used by them in the Lord's supper, the dog would not eat the sacrament, because it does not consume the bread as a symbol or sign" (p. 108).

"The Catholic Church merely teaches that the body of Christ is, by the power of God, present under the eucharistic species" (p. 105); and the Romanist may believe, without being accounted a heretic, with us Protestants, that that presence is only, after all, in a *spiritual* manner or *spiritually*! It was scarcely worth while burning Grammer, Ridley, and Latimer, for so they also believed.

Veron quietly winds up his chapter by saying, that this view of the doctrine "is no wise opposed to their (Protestant) salvation. If so, why, then, cause so much disturbance?" and he wishes us to sink all our apparent differences, and join the Church of Rome again.

With regard to "transubstantiation," it may be remembered by some of your readers that Dr. Cahill, in defence of this doctrine [see *Tablet*, 17th December, 1868, and subsequent weeks], in his endeavour to prove not only the reasonableness of the doctrine, but that it is a common occurrence in nature, actually provided a direct parallel to "transubstantiation," the digestion and conversion of the food we eat. "The food, &c., that is, the bread and wine which you and all men may have eaten on this day, had been changed into flesh and blood on your own person and on the persons of all men, by the word of God on the vital action of the stomach," so argues Dr. Cahill.

But hear Veron—

"It is not an article of faith—it is even blasphemous to pretend, that in this mystery the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, in the same manner as the bread that we eat is changed into our bodily substance; nor is it of faith that by transubstantiation the matter of the bread begins to exist under the form of Christ's body just as the matter of bread that is eaten, by nourishing us, begins to subsist under the form of the human body" (p. 107).

He further asserts—

"Nor is it of faith that transubstantiation is effected by the reproduction or consecration of Christ's body" (p. 108); or "that the bread and wine are annihilated by the words of consecration" (p. 109), though the Council of Trent, be it remembered, desires us to believe that the substance of these elements ceases to exist!

But why pursue the subject? Veron thinks that the doctrine of his Church, as he explains it, "is not a just ground for separation" (p. 118); in fact, in other words, so long as we submit to the dominion of the priests of Rome, we may believe just as we please. The teaching of the Church of Rome is at all times and in all things so plastic and accommodating that it will suit all creeds, creeds, and shades of belief from the Brahmin Hindoo, as witnessed by the Jesuit missions, to the heretic Protestant, as witnessed by Veron.

I will now only repeat, that this book from which I am quoting is declared to be in the "preface"—"WELL KNOWN

b Semel concepit Dei filium, divitum Dei filium advenit quotidie corporalis. —Quib. 8.2. super dominum missis, Lect. IV. Ed. Lugd. 1612.

c "Corpus et sanguinem Domini tenimur non solum sacramentum, sed veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari frangit, et datum debet a sacerdoti." —Graecia corp. pur. eas. (tom. I, p. 210), par. III, dist. 2, c. 42; Paris, 1612.

d Page 98; Edition, Birmingham, 1838. Translated by Veroworth a Roman priest.

AND UNIVERSALLY ACKNOWLEDGED; and the Rev. Dr. Murray, in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons, in answer to a question, enumerates, among others, this book as containing "the most authentic exposition of the faith of the [Roman] Catholic Church."

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
London, Feb., 1858. C. H. COLLETTE.

"THIS IS MY BODY."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I do not think it is sufficiently considered in the controversy as to the meaning of these words, what I may say *must* have been their import to the Apostles themselves. Romanists, arguing from their plain literal meaning, ought not to lose sight of the sense in which, as it appears to us, the Apostles *must* have understood them. Let us consider facts. The Apostles eat what was given to them; and after they had sung an hymn they went out into the Mount of Olives. If the Romish doctrine be true, each portion of bread was transubstantiated into Christ's flesh and blood, body, soul, and divinity; so that, whilst he continued to sit opposite to them at table, he was really, at the same time, corporally and locally in each of their stomachs. This is startling enough. But consider further. It is into Christ's *slain* body that the bread must be supposed to be transubstantiated, according to our Lord's words—"This is my body, which is broken for you," and "this is my blood, which is shed for many." But how could what the Apostles eat be Christ's *slain* body, when His *slain* body did not then actually exist? If it was already slain, then our redemption had been completed without Christ's sufferings and death upon the cross. But if a *slain* body had as yet no existence, how could bread be changed into it? I may be told of God's omnipotence, and that all things are possible to him. And so, doubtless, are all things *that are possible in themselves*. But it is no more derogatory to His perfections that He cannot perform contradictions than that He cannot do wrong, annihilate Himself, or make one of His creatures greater than Himself. Now, it is a contradiction in terms to say that a solid body is locally in two places at once. And it is also a contradiction to assert that anything exists and does not exist at the same time.

Let Romanists look their doctrine plainly in the face. They must maintain either of two hypotheses. The Apostles, after receiving, carried about in their stomachs, each of them, a corporal body of their Master, "who still walked beside them; and *that* a *slain* body, though no such thing existed for at least twelve hours afterwards. If they reject this theory, then the words, "this is my body," if they have a transubstantiating effect *now*, which they had not when addressed to the Apostles, have it not from any necessity for their being understood in their plain, literal sense.

It satisfies us, members of this Reformed Church, to understand these words in the only sense in which we conceive it possible for them to have been addressed to the Apostles; in whatever sense the bread and wine were to the Apostles the body and blood of Christ, we are content to receive them only in the same sense. It suffices us to feed on Him in no other manner than they did. We will not believe that we have eaten Christ's material body, unless it be granted that the Apostles did so likewise. He still sitting opposite to them at table. Neither will we believe that we receive His solid body slain, unless it be conceded that His Apostles partook of His *slain* body twelve hours before the fact of His death was accomplished.

Of course, there is nothing new in all this, nor, indeed, can there well be in anything connected with so long vexed a question. But still it may not be useless to recall attention to points which, after being fully canvassed at former periods of the Church, have been laid aside, as if no more light could be thrown upon them. I do not recollect seeing the matter put in this way of late, and, therefore, I have troubled you with a few lines on the subject.

Your obedient servant,
C. C.

THE HOLY FATHERS ACKNOWLEDGE THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER; AND THAT THE CHURCH OR THE FOUNDATION NEVER FAILS.

[This letter is so long, and the authorities referred to so numerous, that we are reluctantly obliged to divide it, and postpone any comments upon it till our next number. We think it would greatly contribute to Dr. Geraghty's letters being generally read if he would either condense or divide his communications.—ED. C. L.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

RESPECTED SIR,—We have seen (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Feb. 18, 1858), how, John xxi., 15, 16, 17, and the first words of Matt. xvi., 18, 19, were understood by SS. Eucherius, Ambrose, Cyprian, &c., and in this, the torrent of the fathers is with them, as will appear by taking their depositions on these texts at large.

Tertullian: "Peter, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of loosing and of binding." (De Prescript., n. 22.)

• Phelan and O'Sullivan's "Digest of Evidence," &c.; Commons, 22nd March, 1825. Report, p. 231.

St. Cyprian: "There is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one chair founded by the mouth of Christ upon Peter; besides which one altar and one priesthood, no other altar, no new priesthood can be established." (Epist. xliii. Oxon. xl. Benedict.) What St. Cyprian means is this: that if Christ, instead of building, as He did, His Church on one, or on Peter alone, had built it equally on all the Apostles; then, in the event of divisions in the Church (an event which did happen), we might, with an easy conscience, be in the communion of *any* of the dissentient churches; or, easier still, in the communion of no Church at all; since on this supposition, the Church of C. P. or of Alexandria, or of Rome would all have equal pretensions; but that jarring creeds and communions could constitute the true Church is in flat contradiction to Scripture (John x. 16, *ibid.* xvii. 11, 20, 21, Acts ii. 42, 44), and to the tradition of the Church in all ages.

St. James, Bishop of Nisibis, in Asia, ann. 325: "Simon, head of the Apostles, was by our Lord forgiven, and made the foundation and rock of the Church." (Orat. vii. de Pœnit. tom. v. p. 57, Galland.)

St. Hilary: "Peter, to whom He had given the keys, and on whom He was to build His Church, against which the gates of hell should not prevail." (In Ps. cxxxii.) "Peter's confession was highly recompensed. In thy new nomination, oh, happy foundation of the Church, oh, rock, worthy of the superstructure, which was to baffle the infernal gates, and all the bars of death! Oh, heaven's gate-keeper, to whose discretion are given the keys of eternity." (Comm. in Matt. xvi., n. 7, p. 749.)

St. Cyril of Jerusalem: "Peter, the first of the Apostles, and heaven's key-bearer." (Catech. xvii., n. 27.) "Peter, who carries with him the keys of heaven." (Catech. vi., n. 15.)

St. Ephrem, Syrus: "Lord! to whom didst thou give the heavenly keys? To Bar Jonas, the prince of the Apostles." (T. iii., Syr. Parcen. 33.) "Peter, the keeper of heaven, and the first-born of those that bear the keys." (T. iii., Gr. In. SS. Apost. p. 464.)

St. Gregory of Nyssa: "Through Peter He gave the prelacy of the keys of the celestial order." (T. ii. de Castig.) "Peter, the head of the Apostleship, is celebrated; and so are the other members of the Church; yet on him is the Church built; for he is the rock on which the Lord built His Church." (De St. Steph. t. vi. Galland.)

St. Gregory Nazianzen: "Peter, who became the inviolable rock, and who had the keys given to him." (T. ii. Carm. 2 p. 51. *ibid.*) See also t. I., p. 454. Galland. edit.

St. Macarius of Egypt, an. 325: "To Moses succeeded Peter, who had the new Church of Christ delivered into his hands, and the true priesthood." (Homil. xxvi., p. 101, t. vii. Gal. edit.)

St. Basil the Great: "Peter, who, because of the superiority of his faith, received upon himself the Church's superstructure." (Advers. Eunom. n. 4.) "Peter, who was preferred before all the disciples; who alone received a greater testimony; to whom were given the keys." (T. ii. p. 1. Procem. de jud. Dei.)

St. Pacian: "The Lord spake to Peter alone, in order that he might lay the foundation of unity from one." (Epist. iii. n. xi. p. 265, t. vii. Galland.)

Marius Victorinus of Africa (Gal. 1, 18): "Paul, to whom all things were revealed, knew that he ought to visit Peter, as him to whom the chief authority had been given by Christ." (T. iii. Script. vit.)

St. Epiphanius: "Peter, who was the prince of the Apostles, who was a firm rock on which is fixed the Lord's faith, on which rock the Church is in every way built; first, in that he confessed Christ, and heard that on this rock of firm faith I will build my Church. Moreover, he also became then the firm rock of the foundation of God's house, in his being, after his conversion, found worthy to hear—"Feed My sheep." (Lib. ii. aduers. heræs. t. 1, p. 500, a. n., edit. Petav. an. 1622.) "Peter, the prince of the Apostles, to whom were given the keys of the kingdom, is said, Gal. ii. 9." (T. ii. in Anch.)

St. Ambrose: "He said to Peter, 'I prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.' But, to the same Peter He had formerly said—Matt. xvi. 18, 19—How could He not confirm his faith, to whom He gave the kingdom, and whom, when He styles a rock, He pointed out the Church's foundation." (T. ii. lib. iv. de Fide, c. v., p. 531.) "Not of Peter's self, but of his faith was it said, that the gates of hell, &c., which sentence vanquished hell, and shut out many a heresy; for the Church, being often assailed, must needs an invincible basis." (De Incarn. 5.) "To Peter it is said, 'To thee I will give the keys'—the selected one in the apostleship obtained jurisdiction." (Epist. lxxi. ad Horont.)

St. Jerome: "Peter was the prince of the Apostles, on whom, in eternal fixity, the Church of the Lord is built." (Lib. contra. Pelag., n. 14.)

St. Chrysostom: "True, all were Apostles, all were to sit on twelve thrones, &c., still it was the three He took; of which same three He said that some were superior; and He sets Peter before them, saying, 'Lovest thou Me?' &c. Yet John was the well-beloved." (Hom. xxxi. in ep. ad. Rom. n. 4.) "And yet in spite of this lapse, He reinstated him, and committed to his hand the supremacy over the universal Church." (T. ii. hom. v. de Pœnit. p. 366, Bened.) "You may ask, why did James

get the see of Jerusalem? I answer, that He made Peter not master of that see, but of the habitable globe." (Hom. lxxxviii. in Joan., n. 6.)

St. Asterius, towards the end of the 4th age: "Isaias says that the Father laid the Son—the corner stone; meaning that the world has Him for its basis. But the Son nominated Peter to be the Church's foundation: 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church.' Other foundations no man can lay." (1 Cor. iii.) Yet with a like name did our Saviour honour the first of His Apostles: calling him the rock of the faith. Through Peter, then, the permanence of the Church is maintained; and we stand secure on his structure, in spite of the devil and legions of tyrants; as the Word says, 'The floods came, and the winds blew, and it fell not.' Therefore, when God the Saviour ascended into heaven, he, Peter, it was who took up his place; for he ever bore in mind the command given him: Feed my lambs. God endowed none of the disciples with His own gifts like Peter, in placing him, as He did, above all. John reposed on the Lord's breast. James was called the son of thunder; but they must all yield to Peter, and confess that they hold the second place. He everywhere precedes the other disciples. He it was who said, 'Thou art Christ,' &c., and was, therefore, made the Church's foundation; was entrusted with the keys of heaven, and made lord of the gate thereof, and the president of the entrance to the kingdom." (Hom. in Apost. Pet. et Paul.)

St. Prudentius, of the 4th age: "Here are two princes of the Apostles: one, the Apostle of the Gentiles; the other, holding the first chair, opens the gates of eternity that have been entrusted to him." (Hymn. 2, in honor. St. Laurent. t. viii. Galland.)

St. Optatus: "Peter, then, sat first in that very chair which is the chief mark of the Church." (Lib. 2, n. 4.)

St. Augustine: "Peter himself, to whom, bearing a figure of the Church, the Lord says, 'Upon this rock I will build My Church.'" (Epist. iii. a. d. Generos.) "Peter, on account of the supremacy of his Apostleship, represented the whole Church." (T. iii., p. 2470, Bened.)

"Peter! what hast thou left that thou shouldest receive the whole world?" (T. iv., p. 1656, *ibid.*) "Peter, that is, in the order of the Apostles, the chief and the principal." (T. v., p. 597.) "Some things are said respecting Peter which are not clear, except when referred to the Church, of which he is acknowledged to have been the personification on account of his supremacy, such as—'To thee I will give the keys.'" (T. iv., p. 1733.)

St. Maximus: "Peter, as a shepherd, received the flock to keep, and is called the rock of the Church, as the Lord declares—'Thou art Peter,' &c. (Homil. iv., de Petro.) "To Peter was given the helm of the universal Church." (Homil. iii. de Eod. Fest.)

P. Orosius: "O, Peter, on which Christ built His Church, &c., reply to this man. Did Christ say to thee, Pelagius, 'Amen. I say to thee, flesh and blood hath not revealed,' &c.? Did He say to thee, 'Thou shalt be called Cephas?' Did He assure thee, 'On this rock I will build My Church?'" (De lib. arbit. t. vi., Bib. Max. SS. P.P., p. 455-7.)

Zacchaeus: "Peter, in whose person is contained the whole ecclesiastic authority, through the Lord's sentence—Matt. xvi. 18, 19." (Lib. ii., consult. Zacch., c. xviii., t. ix., p. 238, Galland.)

St. Cyril of Alexandria: "He changed his name into Peter, from Petrus; for on him He was to found His Church" (T. iv., Comm. in Joan., p. 131.)

Theodore: "Thus did this great basis receive a command to feed the Lord's sheep."

Leo I. of Rome: "Thou art Peter: though I am the inviolable rock—the corner stone, other foundations besides which no man can lay; yet thou also art a rock, 'on which', says He, 'I will build My Church,' and, because Peter confessed Him, He said to him, 'I will give to thee the keys.' The other Apostles and rulers of the Church were, indeed, sharers in this decree; yet not vainly is that given to one, which may be intimated to all. The Lord says, Luke xxii. 31, 32—In Peter, therefore, they are all strengthened. So that, if things are rightly ordered in our days, it is owing to him the prince of the universal Church, to whom it was said: 'and thou being converted, &c.,' and to whom it was said thrice; 'feed my sheep.'" (Serm. lxii. de Pass. Domini.) "To Peter above the rest, by the keys, is the care of the Lord's fold consigned." (Serm. lxxii. de Ascens. Domini.) "The Lord pleased that his institution should pertain to all the Apostles, so that he lodged it principally in Peter, the chief of the Apostles, and the head, that he who dares to withdraw from the unity of Peter might know himself to be an alien from the divine mystery. For it pleased Him that he whom He had made the centre of unity should be named that which Himself was, in saying, 'Thou art Peter,' &c., that the eternal structure might be embodied in the unity of Peter." (Epist. x. ad Episcop. Vienensis.) "The rock of the Catholic faith, which name the Apostle Peter received from the Lord, admits no heresy." (Epist. cxix. ad Max. Antioch.)

Arnobius, junior: "To the penitent Apostle a higher rank was given than he had lost by his fall; for no other apostle received the name of *the* shepherd; since the Lord

* T. iii. Orat. de Carit. p. 1399.